Info-ParaNet Newsletters Volume I Number 333

Monday, November 26th 1990

Today's Topics:

Re: Ed Walters video
New crop circle idea?
Re: ED WALTERS VIDEO
Re: JFK'S UFO CONNECTION?
Re: AWAKE.TST FILE
Re: GB Photos
Re: ED WALTERS VIDEO
Re: Ed Walters video
Lazar's Element 115
Re: Mysterious Lights In Europe

From: Steve.Rose@f134.n109.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Steve Rose)
Subject: Re: Ed Walters video
Date: 21 Nov 90 03:19:09 GMT

>> conditions on their own...though they have gotten a lot better
>> with each new model generation.
>
> The video in question is remarkably noise-free for a tape
> shot in darkness with a first-generation Sony 8mm camcorder.
> Suspiciously noise free.....

There are subtle methods of detection...but one must know what to observe. Naturally, there had to be *some* type of light present to obtain a visual picture. In addition, there has to be a certain *amount* of light to bring the picture over the chip's noise threshold. Early chips required more light. They also suffered a malady due to limitations of design and manufacture. This is seen as the well-know 'vertical smear'...observed when the camera is shooting a light source directly. You may or may not notice a thin red vertical strip intersecting the light in the picture. Tube cameras do not exhibit this phenomenon. Newer chip cameras do not, either.

Along with the picture information are the effects of electronic timing signals. Each format has its own 'signature' of these signals...due to the way the signals get recorded on a given format. A standard NTSC waveform monitor scope would help identify the signal even further.

Finally, the early 8's were severly limited to the old VHS standard of resolution...<240 lines. If any image not electronically enhanced seems to show a higher grade of quality than this...it is extremely doubtful it was recorded in that format.

--
Steve Rose - via FidoNet node 1:207/109
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name

INTERNET: Steve.Rose@f134.n109.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Rod.Wilson@p1.f66.n147.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Rod Wilson)
Subject: New crop circle idea?
Date: 22 Nov 90 02:46:04 GMT

In a message to postmaster@scicom.alphacd <20 Nov 90 22:09:00> Kelly Shropshire wrote:

> KS> I wonder if the crop circle phenominon is related to another kind of
> KS> circle, the so called "fairy ring" of mushroooms.

I am unfamiliar with the phenonina you describe, however I have watched two TV shows, on the crop circles around stone henge. The information that I have on the crop circles is that they can form within minutes and that in each case the molecular structure of the plant inside the circle is reported to have changed to one of a more crystaline alignment. I am interested in any additional information you may have on the mushroom circles.

--
Rod Wilson - via FidoNet node 1:207/109
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Rod.Wilson@p1.f66.n147.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Pete.Porro@f414.n154.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Pete Porro)
Subject: Re: ED WALTERS VIDEO
Date: 22 Nov 90 17:38:45 GMT

I have two video 8 units and I though the resolution was supposed to be 400 lines. I'll have to read again. One is that tiny hand held unit about the size of an 8mm movie camera. It's been everywhere with me, and does take some low light videos even when it says it can't. Viewfinder only, so it runs a long time on a charge. The bigger unit with zoom and all that extra is actually used very little. I dragged it around on one vacation and have opted for the little one since then. My arm still hurts. 8*)

So what exactally is the problem you find in Ed's video as to noise in the pictures, and lighting? I seem to be missing the point somewhere.
--
Pete Porro - via FidoNet node 1:207/109
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Pete.Porro@f414.n154.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Pete.Porro@f414.n154.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Pete Porro)
Subject: Re: JFK'S UFO CONNECTION?
Date: 22 Nov 90 17:46:30 GMT

I can only say I have found no compelling evidence that the Kennedy murder and UFO related causes. It's not evidence that makes me arrive at this opinion, it's the lack of evidence that it had anything to do with ET's or paranormal causes. For those who look for conspiracy in nearly everything this case sure fits well. I hope to live long enough to see what's in the sealed files that are supposed to be opened in 2012 or somewhere in that range. (I think it was 50 years after the murder) I'd be about 65 then, and considering that I smoke, it's not as likely and more healthy habits of others. If I don't make it, I hope it was worth waiting for, for the rest of you.

Happy Thanksgiving!
--
Pete Porro - via FidoNet node 1:207/109
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Pete.Porro@f414.n154.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Pete.Porro@f414.n154.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Pete Porro)
Subject: Re: AWAKE.TST FILE
Date: 22 Nov 90 17:53:17 GMT

I sent the file on the echo because it was easier. I really wish there was a Kennedy echo since it's a never ending story, and would have a place to concentrate the discussion. One nice thing about Paranet is that I can read all the messages in one day unlike some more active echo areas that are so busy that it takes and hour to wade through posts. The other part is that the level or information is better.
--
Pete Porro - via FidoNet node 1:207/109
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Pete.Porro@f414.n154.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: John.Hicks@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG (John Hicks)
Subject: Re: GB Photos

Date: 22 Nov 90 17:43:00 GMT

> I guess Dr. Hynek didn't want to make the book too
> shocking. It was shocking enough!

That's basically what Phil said.

jbh

--
John Hicks - via FidoNet node 1:207/109
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: John.Hicks@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: John.Hicks@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG (John Hicks)
Subject: Re: ED WALTERS VIDEO
Date: 22 Nov 90 17:54:01 GMT

> Which photo has an object behind a darker tree. (If you has a
> number from Ed's book it would be enough). I think you have some

Photo #1 in the book. Notice that the left side of the object appears to be behind the tree.
Presuming the photos were cooked up in the darkroom, that wouldn't be a big deal to do. It would be very difficult to accomplish with an in-camera double exposure.

> Contact Printing did come to mind. A person could remove the
> film pack, something like a light tight bag would be necessary,
> place the saucer photo on the blank film sheet, shine a
> flashlight on it a few seconds, remove the original, and then
> place it back into the camera. Now shoot a photo of anything and
> it will have the contact print on it.

That's pretty well feasible, except that the Polaroid film is daylight-balanced. You'd have to know that and filter your flashlight to blue, or the colors would be extremely yellow. That'd be a dead giveaway.
BTW, did you know that you can get black & white Polaroid negative pack film? Those negs could be used for shadow/highlight masking etc. in contact printing. Or shot in the camera.
Not so with the later 600-series cameras, which tends to lead me toward the idea of enlarging slides onto Polaroid in a darkroom. That'd be by far the easiest way.

> Since you have more photo knowledge that I about color, what
> would the comlimentary colors be if Ed's UFO was made from a

> negative image, contact printed onto a Polaroid? I still think
> it look like a lantern or a lamp shade.

A complimentary color for most of the object would be yellow, but there's another problem in using the common C-41 negs, and that's the heavy orange mask. Of course you could filter for it or shoot E-6 and develop it in C-41 and you'd have a fairly strange neg but no mask.
That's a very interesting idea. Reverse the colors and also reverse the density. Light would be dark etc. I'll fiddle with that idea a little.

jbh

--
John Hicks - via FidoNet node 1:207/109
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: John.Hicks@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: John.Hicks@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG (John Hicks)
Subject: Re: Ed Walters video
Date: 22 Nov 90 18:09:02 GMT

> Naturally, there had to be *some* type of light present to
> obtain a visual picture. In addition, there has to be a certain
> *amount* of light to bring the picture over the chip's noise
> threshold. Early chips required more light. They also suffered
> a malady due to limitations of design and manufacture. This is
> seen as the well-know 'vertical smear'...observed when the
> camera is shooting a light source directly. You may or may not
> notice a thin red vertical strip intersecting the light in the
> picture. Tube cameras do not exhibit this phenomenon. Newer
> chip cameras do not, either.

Foreground illumination was a white porch/security light, which very faintly illuminates foreground bushes. The leaves are almost not visible.
Point-source lights are the object and streetlights.
The rest of the image is blackness.
In the dark areas, I didn't see anywhere near the expected level of video noise. I didn't notice any vertical smear, and also I didn't see any blooming of the point sources.
Bruce said that the exposure system of the camera isn't linear in that the gain increases in addition to the iris being opened. So, in the circumstances, the iris should have been open and gain at maximum. Which I'd expect to make lots of noise.

> Along with the picture information are the effects of electronic
> timing signals. Each format has its own 'signature' of these
> signals...due to the way the signals get recorded on a given

> format. A standard NTSC waveform monitor scope would help
> identify the signal even further.

That's a thought. I wonder if anyone's looked at the tape in such a manner.

> Finally, the early 8's were severly limited to the old VHS
> standard of resolution...<240 lines. If any image not
> electronically enhanced seems to show a higher grade of quality
> than this...it is extremely doubtful it was recorded in that
> format.

Resolution seems about right. The taped image wasn't anywhere near as sharp as the monitor displayed for other tapes, which were professionally-produced VHS. Since the ufo tape was duped onto VHS, I expected and saw less resolution.

Another interesting aside. I tried to talk with Bruce M. about this stuff and he neatly avoided the issue. He was willing to talk at great length about other things.

The things he attributed to the camera's electronics and control system would appear to me to be expected to make the tape worse. Strange.

Since the tape I saw was duped, I wouldn't be surprised if the image was cleaned up a little, but I have some trouble believing that *all video noise could be removed*.

I talked with a couple of people who have seen the original tape, and they all said it wasn't noisy or snowy.

jbh

--
John Hicks - via FidoNet node 1:207/109
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: John.Hicks@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Kurt.Lochner@p22.f66.n147.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Kurt Lochner)
Subject: Lazar's Element 115
Date: 24 Nov 90 18:03:16 GMT

Originally on ParaNet ET, I wrote to Pete Porro about this Element 115. I've some education in physics and think that I've hit on what the stuff might actually be.

You know, there's something that bothers me about Lazer. The reports so far indicate that he's an Electro-Physicist but I've some doubts as to that.

First off, there's nothing in Physics to support an element with an atomic weight of 115. So here's the new thread....

If there's some exotic "element" that powers these craft
and assuming that nothing unusually different exists in the
universe in the way of physics, then I suggest the following..

I'm not a chemist at heart and wouldn't care to take it up
as another major, even for a Masters Degree. It does strike
me that the discussions that I've had with Rod Wilson here
about potentials of difference may apply, f'rinstance...

An "element", with properties resembling to present day
instrumentation an atomic wieght of 115, might be a new
sort of alloy that can be fabricated out of two, perhaps
three dissimilar metals by means of a furnace in hard vacuum
with the eternal cold/background of "outer space" as a
means of "super-quenching" the material into a solid
before the base elements can separate.

Do I need to explain "Quenching" of metals?

Ok, so this alloy, when heated again releases an exothermic
reaction of these base elements trying to separate from each
other. Hmmm, I guess a good analogy would be like freezing
a bunch of magnets together, with their "like" poles facing
each other, in another media, water or something like that.

Then you'd melt the "ice" and the magnets would "want" to
move apart, just as they should, right? Now all we need to
keep alert for is some kind of physical clues that might be
byproducts of such a reaction. Potassium has been indicated.
Heard of any others?

All of the universe is constrained by physics, Einstein was
most certainly correct, God does NOT play dice......

He plays piano and needs help tuning the damn thing!

--
Kurt Lochner - via FidoNet node 1:310/8
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Kurt.Lochner@p22.f66.n147.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: gateh@conncoll.bitnet
Subject: Re: Mysterious Lights In Europe
Date: 26 Nov 90 18:55:17 GMT

+ Thanks Greg. Did it indicate that this answered all of the
+ concerns about the similarities of the UFO in Belgium?

+
+ Michael Corbin - via FidoNet node 1:207/109

I didn't realize that there had been such concerns, although it certainly isn't surprising in light of the proximity of the two events. The note I forwarded was in its entirety - there was no mention of any relationship or lack thereof between the two events, however I would think it relatively safe to assume that the two are unconnected (I don't recall seeing any mention of the happenings in Belgium in the Space digest). The Belgium incident, at least as describe by the military's summary, holds few if any similarities to the re-entry of the soviet rocket.

Cheers! - Gregg

Gregg TeHennepe | SysAdm, Academic Computing | Yes, but this
gateh@conncoll.bitnet | Connecticut College, New London, CT | one goes to 11...

********To have your comments in the next issue, send electronic mail to********
'infopara' at the following address:

UUCP	{ncar,isis,boulder}!scicom!infopara
DOMAIN	infopara@scicom.alphacdc.com
ADMIN Address	infopara-request@scicom.alphacdc.com
	{ncar,isis,boulder}!scicom!infopara-request

**********The**End**of**Info-ParaNet**Newsletter**********